

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is specifically requested. In the outstanding office action, claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1-21 are rejected.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-20, 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Yamamoto (US 2003/0037110).

Claims 6, 13, 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto.

### **RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION**

In response to the office action, claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, and 21 were amended. Claims 5, 12, and 19 were canceled without prejudice. Claims 7, 10, 14, and 17 remain unchanged.

### **SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS**

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):**

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-20, 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamamoto (US 2003/0037110).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-20, 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Yamamoto as herein amended. Applicant respectfully submits that the claim amendments contained herein were not made to overcome the above rejection as being anticipated by Yamamoto, rather the claim amendments have been introduced to clarify the subject matter of the invention.

The present invention, as recited in amended claims 1, 8, and 15 are respectively, a method, a computer readable medium of instructions, and a geo-location analysis system for determining desired physical locations of reference points for use in identifying geographic locations of mobile terminals in an area of interest within a wireless network. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite the step of analyzing the levels of precision in the area of interest to update the visual display with the location information of the reference terminals and the levels of precision in geo-location calculations for determining respective geographic locations of the mobile terminals. No new matter is added by these amendments, and adequate support is found in paragraphs [0068], [0070], [0083], [0088], [0089], and [0093] of the Applicant's specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that Yamamoto (US 2003/0037110) patent actually teaches away from the present invention since in Yamamoto there is no attempt or intention to generate a visual indication that shows the expected levels of precision in geo-location calculations for determining respective geographic locations of the mobile terminals. Yamamoto provides a chat room service which allows computer or cell phone users to have text based conversations with each other via a cell phone network or computer network in real time i.e. the access to chat room is based on terminal or a user-specified location, where the location of the users are displayed as nodes in the visual display. In addition, while describing the text based conversations, there is no mentioning of levels of precision and updating of visual display with location information in Yamamoto.

More specifically, Yamamoto teaches using the location information of the nodes for granting access to the network for services such as a chat room service. In contrast, the present invention requires that the location information of the nodes be used to generate a visual indication representing expected levels of precision in geo-location calculations for use in determining respective geographic locations of the mobile terminals. Thus the present invention

enables network infrastructure planners to evaluate the placements of reference terminals in order to optimize the geo-location coverage for use in identifying the geographic locations of mobile terminals in a wireless network.

Claims 2, 3, 4, and 7 contain further limitations of the now believed to be allowable amended claim 1. Claims 9, 10, 11, 14 contains further limitations of the now believed to be allowable claim 8. Also claims 16, 17, 18, and 21 contain further limitations of the now believed to be allowable claim 15, and therefore all are believed to be in condition for allowance as well.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

Claims 6, 13, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto. Based upon the Examiner's comments on page 5 of the office action that the Examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious "to provide the teaching of the mobile node and the ad-hoc peer-to-peer wireless network into the system of Yamamoto to enhance the system performance of the mobile terminal in which determining its locations", Applicant has responded accordingly.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims 6, 13, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yamamoto as herein amended. As discussed previously, Yamamoto does not anticipate nor describe the "visual indication representing expected levels of precision" or "analyzing the levels of precision to update the visual display with the location information" as recited in Applicant's claims. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Yamamoto to extend the concept of "generating visual indication representing expected levels of precision, and analyzing the levels of precision to update the

visual display with the location information” to the teaching of the mobile node and the ad-hoc peer-to-peer wireless network, because as required by claim 6, 13, and 20, reference terminals i.e. fixed nodes are needed to perform the analysis of levels of precision in geo-location calculations, and as such there is no mentioning of reference terminals in Yamamoto system.

Applicant submits that claims 6, 13, and 20 are allowable over Yamamoto based on their dependencies upon claim 1, 8, and 15 respectively which claims were shown to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submit that claims 6, 13, and 20 are in proper condition for allowance and request that claims 6, 13, and 20 may now be passed to allowance.

The other references of record have been reviewed and applicant's invention is deemed patentably distinct and nonobvious over each taken alone or in combination.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that the above rejections be withdrawn.

Inasmuch as this amendment distinguishes all of the applicants' claims over the prior art references, for the many reasons indicated above, passing of this case is now believed to be in order. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities which can be corrected by Examiner's amendment, or in the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, a telephone call to the undersigned at (954) 723-6449 is respectfully solicited.

Authorization is hereby given to charge any fees, or credit overpayment necessitated by actions taken herein to Deposit Account 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

September 21, 2006

Motorola, Inc.  
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard  
Law Department – MD1610  
Plantation, Florida 33322  
Customer Number: 24273

By: /Randi L. Karpinia/  
Randi L. Karpinia  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 46,148  
Tel: 954-723-6449  
Fax: 954-723-3871  
E-Mail: [docketing.florida@motorola.com](mailto:docketing.florida@motorola.com)